



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1430
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/745,290

12/20/2000

Adam L. Berger

12481-002001

6981

826

7590

01/03/2006

ALSTON & BIRD LLP
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

SMITH, PETER J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/745,290

Applicant(s)

BERGER ET AL.

Examiner

Peter J. Smith

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40, 42-50 and 52-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40, 42-50 and 52-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/13/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 10/26/2005.
2. Claims 1-40, 42-50, and 52-54 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 26, 27, 28, 33, and 43 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. **Claims 1-40, 42-50, and 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al. (hereinafter "Tso"), US 6,421,733 B1 provisional filed 3/25/1997 in view of Tsimelzon, US 6,763,388 filed 8/10/1999.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Tso teaches altering portions of a text of an original version of a digital document to produce a revised version of the digital document in which the text is shorter than the text of the original document in fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 1 lines 25-31, col. 2 lines 44-49, col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, and col. 8 lines 22-40. Tso teaches the altering being done based on a set of at least one preference, the set of at least one preference being associated with a device and independent of an association with the digital document in col. 7 lines 21-29 and col. 7 lines 43-54. Tso teaches receiving over a communication channel a request for the digital document from the device in fig. 1, fig. 3, fig. 5, and col. 2 lines 56-58. Tso teaches transmitting the revised version over the communication channel in response to the request in fig. 1, fig. 3, fig. 5, and col. 2 lines 56-58.

Tso does not teach wherein altering includes segmenting the digital document into subdocuments, and wherein at least one of the portion of subdocuments transmitted to device includes a link to an adjacent subdocument. Tsimelzon does teach segmenting the digital document into a plurality of ordered subdocuments, and wherein at least one of the portion of subdocuments transmitted to device includes a link to an adjacent subdocument in fig. 9, fig. 13, col. 2 lines 5-24, col. 2 lines 45-65, col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5, and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Tso and Tsimelzon to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the subdocument creation and transmission as taught by Tsimelzon to have improved the transcoding features of Tso so that a user would have had the option of receiving one of a plurality of subdocument revised versions

Art Unit: 2176

as is taught by Tsimelzon instead of a single revised subdocument as is explicitly taught by Tso. This would have allowed the user to have viewed different subdocument parts of the original document as is taught by Tsimelzon in col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5 and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Tso teaches in which altering portions of the text includes applying more than one transformation selectively to the text in col. 8 lines 10-13.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Tso teaches selecting transformations to be applied to the text as part of the altering step, based on preferences associated with the device in col. 7 lines 21-29.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Tso teaches in which the preferences are associated with the device based on a unique identifier of the device in col. 7 lines 21-29.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Tso teaches in which the preferences are stored in advance of the request for a document in col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 13.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Tso teaches in which the preferences are stored in a database associated with a server in Tso teaches selecting transformations to be applied to the text as part of the altering step, based on preferences associated with the device in col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 13.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Tso teaches in which the preferences are indicated by a user through the interface of the device in fig. 4 and col. 11 lines 4-49.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Tso teaches in which the preferences are indicated by the user through the interface of a device other than the device from which the request for the digital document is made in fig. 4 and col. 11 lines 4-49.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding dependent claim 9, Tso teaches in which the preferences are indicated on a form provided from a server in fig. 4 and col. 11 lines 4-49.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Tso teaches in which preferences are stored for each device from which requests for documents may be received in col. 7 lines 21-29.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Tso teaches in which preferences are stored for each type of device from which requests for documents may be received in col. 7 lines 21-29.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Tso teaches in which the preferences are stored on the device in fig. 5 and col. 11 line 50 – col. 13 line 25.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Tso teaches in which the preferences are stored on the device using a cookie mechanism in col. 11 line 50 – col. 12 line 3.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Tso teaches in which the altering depends on the type of the device in col. 7 lines 21-29.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Tso teaches also including receiving information from the device identifying the type of device in col. 7 lines 21-29 and col. 11 line 50 – col. 12 line 3.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Tso teaches in which the altering is performed at a proxy server in fig. 3, fig. 5, and col. 3 lines 18-30.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Tso teaches in which the altering is performed at an origin server in col. 3 lines 18-30.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Tso teaches in which the device comprises a device that is not configured to display the entire document at one time in col. 7 lines 21-29 and col. 8 lines 22-40.

Regarding dependent claim 19, Tso teaches in which the device comprises a personal digital assistant, a hand-held device, or a telephone in col. 7 lines 21-29 and col. 8 lines 22-40.

Regarding dependent claim 20, Tso teaches in which the altering comprises date compression in col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Tso teaches in which the altering comprises word abbreviation in col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40.

Regarding dependent claim 22, Tso teaches in which the altering comprises reducing the size of an image included in the original document in col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Tso teaches in which reducing includes image compression, resampling, or conversion from color to black-and-white in col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40.

Regarding dependent claim 24, Tso teaches in which the digital document comprises a web page in fig. 3-5.

Regarding dependent claim 25, Tso teaches creating a subdocument containing less than all of the content information of the original digital document and transmitting the subdocument to the client in response to a request in col. 8 lines 22-40. Tso does not teach segmenting the digital document into subdocuments, and transmitting fewer than all of the subdocuments in response to the request. Tsimelzon does teach segmenting the digital document into subdocuments, and transmitting fewer than all of the subdocuments in response to the request in fig. 9, fig. 13, col. 2 lines 5-24, col. 2 lines 45-65, and col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Tso and Tsimelzon to have created the claimed

Art Unit: 2176

invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the subdocument creation and transmission as taught by Tsimelzon to have improved the transcoding features of Tso so that a user would have had the option of receiving one of a plurality of subdocument revised versions as is taught by Tsimelzon instead of a single revised subdocument as is explicitly taught by Tso. This would have allowed the user to have viewed different subdocument parts of the original document as is taught by Tsimelzon in col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5.

Regarding independent claim 26, Tso teaches maintaining a database that defines a plurality of sets of at least one preferences, wherein the sets of at least one preference are associated with different client devices in fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 1 lines 25-31, col. 2 lines 44-49, col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, and col. 8 lines 22-40. Tso teaches that the plurality of sets of at least one preferences are independent of an association with a web page and wherein the sets of at least one preference define preferred alterations to be performed on full web pages requested by respective client devices that are not configured to display full web pages, the alterations making the documents more suitable for display on the respective client devices col. 7 lines 21-29 and col. 7 lines 43-54.

Tso does not teach wherein alterations include segmenting the full document into subdocuments, and wherein at least one of subdocuments transmitted to device includes a link to an adjacent subdocument. Tsimelzon does teach segmenting the full document into subdocuments, and wherein at least one of subdocuments transmitted to device includes a link to an adjacent subdocument in fig. 9, fig. 13, col. 2 lines 5-24, col. 2 lines 45-65, col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5, and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Tso and Tsimelzon to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the subdocument creation and transmission as taught by Tsimelzon to have improved the transcoding features of Tso so that a user would have had the option of receiving one of a plurality of subdocument revised versions as is taught by Tsimelzon instead of a single revised subdocument as is explicitly taught by Tso. This would have allowed the user to have viewed different subdocument parts of the original document as is taught by Tsimelzon in col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5 and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

Regarding independent claim 27, Tso teaches obtaining from a client device a set of at least one preferences with respect to preferred alterations to be performed on full documents requested by a client device that is not configured to display the full documents in fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 1 lines 25-31, col. 2 lines 44-49, col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40, and col. 11 line 50 – col. 13 line 25. Tso teaches associating the set of preferences with the client device in a database, the set being associated with the client device independent of an association with a document in col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40, and col. 11 line 50 – col. 13 line 25.

Tso does not teach wherein alterations include segmenting the full document into subdocuments, and wherein at least one of subdocuments transmitted to device includes a link to an adjacent subdocument. Tsimelzon does teach segmenting the full document into subdocuments, and wherein at least one of subdocuments transmitted to device includes a link to

Art Unit: 2176

an adjacent subdocument in fig. 9, fig. 13, col. 2 lines 5-24, col. 2 lines 45-65, col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5, and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Tso and Tsimelzon to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the subdocument creation and transmission as taught by Tsimelzon to have improved the transcoding features of Tso so that a user would have had the option of receiving one of a plurality of subdocument revised versions as is taught by Tsimelzon instead of a single revised subdocument as is explicitly taught by Tso. This would have allowed the user to have viewed different subdocument parts of the original document as is taught by Tsimelzon in col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5 and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

Regarding independent claim 28, Tso teaches creating content for web pages to be served to types of clients that are not configured to display full web pages in col. 7 lines 21-29 and col. 8 lines 22-40. Tso teaches storing a plurality of sets of at least one preference defining at least one transformation that is to be made to the full web pages to make them suitable for display on the client devices, the stored sets of preferences each being associated with a respective device independent of an association with a web page, and defining at least one transformation to be made to full web pages requested by that respective device in col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40, and col. 11 line 50 – col. 13 line 25.

Tso does not teach wherein alterations include segmenting the full document into subdocuments, and wherein at least one of subdocuments transmitted to device includes a link to an adjacent subdocument. Tsimelzon does teach segmenting the full document into

Art Unit: 2176

subdocuments, and wherein at least one of subdocuments transmitted to device includes a link to an adjacent subdocument in fig. 9, fig. 13, col. 2 lines 5-24, col. 2 lines 45-65, col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5, and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Tso and Tsimelzon to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the subdocument creation and transmission as taught by Tsimelzon to have improved the transcoding features of Tso so that a user would have had the option of receiving one of a plurality of subdocument revised versions as is taught by Tsimelzon instead of a single revised subdocument as is explicitly taught by Tso. This would have allowed the user to have viewed different subdocument parts of the original document as is taught by Tsimelzon in col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5 and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

Regarding dependent claim 29, Tso teaches in which the digital document comprises an e-mail in col. 6 lines 37-41.

Regarding dependent claim 30, Tso teaches alter portions of a text based on preferences associated with a device and independent of an association with the digital document in col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40, and col. 11 line 50 – col. 13 line 25.

Regarding dependent claim 31, Tso teaches altering portions of a text based on preferences related to at least one capability of the device in col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40, and col. 11 line 50 – col. 13 line 25.

Regarding dependent claim 32, Tso teaches altering portions of a text based on preferences related to at least one capability of the device, and independent of a relation to an

Art Unit: 2176

ability of a user of the device in col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40, and col. 11 line 50 – col. 13 line 25.

Regarding independent claims 33 and 43, Tso teaches receiving a set of at least one preference for altering digital documents to be displayed by a device, wherein the set of at least one preference is associated with the device and independent of an association with a digital document in col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40, and col. 11 line 50 – col. 13 line 25. Tso teaches altering at least a portion of an original version of a digital document based upon the set of at least one preference to thereby produce a revised version of the digital document and wherein the device is capable of displaying the revised version in fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 1 lines 25-31, col. 2 lines 44-49, col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40, and col. 11 line 50 – col. 13 line 25.

Tso does not teach segmenting the digital document into a plurality of subdocuments, at least one of the subdocuments including a link to an adjacent subdocument, the revised version of the digital document including the subdocuments. Tsimelzon does teach segmenting the digital document into a plurality of subdocuments, at least one of the subdocuments including a link to an adjacent subdocument, the revised version of the digital document including the subdocuments in fig. 9, fig. 13, col. 2 lines 5-24, col. 2 lines 45-65, col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5, and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Tso and Tsimelzon to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the subdocument creation and transmission as taught by Tsimelzon to have improved the transcoding features of Tso so that a

Art Unit: 2176

user would have had the option of receiving one of a plurality of subdocument revised versions as is taught by Tsimelzon instead of a single revised subdocument as is explicitly taught by Tso. This would have allowed the user to have viewed different subdocument parts of the original document as is taught by Tsimelzon in col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5 and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

Regarding dependent claims 34 and 44, Tso teaches an origin server in col. 3 lines 18-30. Tso teaches transmitting the revised version of the digital document to the device after producing the revised version in fig. 1, fig. 3, fig. 5, and col. 2 lines 56-58.

Regarding dependent claims 35 and 45, Tso teaches receiving the original version of the digital document from an origin server in response to the origin server receiving a request for the digital document to be displayed by a device in fig. 1, fig. 3, fig. 5, and col. 2 lines 56-58. Tso teaches the original version of the digital of the digital document being independent of an association with a preference for altering at least a portion of the original version to thereby produce a revised version in fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 1 lines 25-31, col. 2 lines 44-49, col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40, and col. 11 line 50 – col. 13 line 25.

Regarding dependent claims 36 and 46, Tso teaches a proxy server which is capable of transmitting the revised version of the digital document to the device after producing the revised version in fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 3 lines 18-30, col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40, and col. 11 line 50 – col. 13 line 25.

Regarding dependent claims 37 and 47, Tso teaches a device which is capable of driving a display to present a revised version of the digital document after producing the revised

Art Unit: 2176

version in fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40, and col. 11 line 50 – col. 13 line 25.

Regarding dependent claims 38 and 48, Tso teaches in which the preferences are associated with the device based on a unique identifier of the device in col. 7 lines 21-29.

Regarding dependent claims 39 and 49, Tso teaches wherein the set of at least one preference is associated with a type of device and independent of an association with a digital document in fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40, and col. 11 line 50 – col. 13 line 25. Tso teaches receiving the set of at least one preference based on the type of device for which the revised version of the digital document is produced in fig. 3, fig. 5, col. 3 line 45 – col. 4 line 47, col. 6 line 64 – col. 8 line 40, and col. 11 line 50 – col. 13 line 25.

Regarding dependent claims 40 and 50, Tso teaches creating a subdocument containing less than all of the content information of the original digital document and transmitting the subdocument to the client in response to a request in col. 8 lines 22-40. Tso does not teach segmenting the digital document into subdocuments, and transmitting fewer than all of the subdocuments in response to the request. Tsimelzon does teach segmenting the digital document into subdocuments, and transmitting fewer than all of the subdocuments in response to the request in fig. 9, fig. 13, col. 2 lines 5-24, col. 2 lines 45-65, col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5, and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Tso and Tsimelzon to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the subdocument creation and transmission as taught by Tsimelzon to have improved the transcoding features of Tso so that a

Art Unit: 2176

user would have had the option of receiving one of a plurality of subdocument revised versions as is taught by Tsimelzon instead of a single revised subdocument as is explicitly taught by Tso. This would have allowed the user to have viewed different subdocument parts of the original document as is taught by Tsimelzon in col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5 and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

Regarding dependent claims 42 and 52, Tso does not teach wherein at least one subdocument transmitted to the device includes a link such that, upon selection of the link, the processor is capable of receiving a request for the adjacent subdocument, and transmitting the adjacent subdocument to the device. Tsimelzon does teach wherein at least one subdocument transmitted to the device includes a link such that, upon selection of the link, the processor is capable of receiving a request for the adjacent subdocument, and transmitting the adjacent subdocument to the device in fig. 9, fig. 13, col. 2 lines 5-24, col. 2 lines 45-65, col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5, and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Tso and Tsimelzon to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the subdocument creation and transmission as taught by Tsimelzon to have improved the transcoding features of Tso so that a user would have had the option of receiving one of a plurality of subdocument revised versions as is taught by Tsimelzon instead of a single revised subdocument as is explicitly taught by Tso. This would have allowed the user to have viewed different subdocument parts of the original document as is taught by Tsimelzon in col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5 and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

Regarding dependent claim 53, Tso teaches determining a maximum document size permissible by a device in col. 7 lines 21-25. Tso teaches converting the digital document into a specific markup language document in col. 8 lines 22-40. Tso does not teach dividing the specific markup language document into a number of segments of a predetermined length. Tsimelzon does teach dividing the specific markup language document into a number of segments of a predetermined length in fig. 9, fig. 13, col. 2 lines 5-24, col. 2 lines 45-65, col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5, and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Tso and Tsimelzon to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the subdocument creation and transmission as taught by Tsimelzon to have improved the transcoding features of Tso so that a user would have had the option of receiving one of a plurality of subdocument revised versions as is taught by Tsimelzon instead of a single revised subdocument as is explicitly taught by Tso. This would have allowed the user to have viewed different subdocument parts of the original document as is taught by Tsimelzon in col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5 and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

Regarding dependent claim 54, Tso does not teach wherein the number of segments is determined by dividing a size of the digital document by the maximum document size permissible by the device. Tsimelzon does teach wherein the number of segments is determined by dividing a size of the digital document by the maximum document size permissible by the device in fig. 9, fig. 13, col. 2 lines 5-24, col. 2 lines 45-65, col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5, and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Tso and Tsimelzon to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the subdocument creation and transmission as taught by Tsimelzon to have improved the transcoding features of Tso so that a user would have had the option of receiving one of a plurality of subdocument revised versions as is taught by Tsimelzon instead of a single revised subdocument as is explicitly taught by Tso. This would have allowed the user to have viewed different subdocument parts of the original document as is taught by Tsimelzon in col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5 and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10/26/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's arguments in pages 13 and 14 that Tso and Tsimelzon do not teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 1-40, 42-50, and 52-54, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner believes Tsimelzon contains the teaching of a link in a subdocument to an adjacent subdocument. The Examiner believes this is particularly taught in fig. 4, 13, and col. 9 line 41 – col. 10 line 14. Tsimelzon also teaches create and edit selection information for each of the element blocks of an original webpage in col. 1 line 64 – col. 2 line 24 and col. 6 lines 1-22. This enables the user to view different combinations of the plurality of blocks. Therefore, since Tsimelzon teaches that element block selection information is determined by the user in col. 1 line 64 – col. 2 line 24 and col. 6 lines 1-22 and links may be activated from a shortpage to another shortpage in 9 line 41 – col. 10 line 14, the Examiner maintains that Tsimelzon teaches

Art Unit: 2176

the limitation of a link in a subdocument to an adjacent subdocument. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that the combination of Tso and Tsimelzon teaches or suggests all the limitations of independent claims 1, 26, 27, 28, 33, and 43.

Regarding Applicant's argument in pages 14-16 that there is no motivation to combine the references of Tso and Tsimelzon, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that both Tso and Tsimelzon are directed to modifying an original page to present a customized document on the client device. Tso teaches in col. 2 lines 47-49 that transcoding includes adding, modifying, or deleting data and also teaches in col. 7 lines 21-24 that the transcoding may be dependent on the display characteristics of the client device. Therefore, the Examiner believes Tso clearly teaches transcoding an original document to a smaller portion subdocument such that the subdocument can be fully displayed in accordance with the client's display characteristics. Tsimelzon also teaches in col. 2 lines 5-24, col. 2 lines 45-65, col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5, and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20 that it is directed to reducing the content of the original document into a plurality of selectable element blocks, or subdocuments, which can be selectively displayed on a client device. Tsimelzon teaches that the client device can be a portable or handheld device in fig. 1, col. 1 lines 51-58, and col. 4 lines 10-35. Thus, the Examiner believes these teachings of Tso and Tsimelzon are related in that they are both attempting to reduce the content of the original document into a transformed subdocument which can be wholly displayed on the client device. Thus, the Examiner maintains that the motivation to combine the references does not come from Applicant's disclosure, but rather comes from the related transformation teachings of Tso and Tsimelzon. Specifically, the Examiner believes one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have modified the transcoding

Art Unit: 2176

teaching of Tso to have created a plurality of subdocuments instead of a single subdocument using the element block teachings of Tsimelzon and the one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have made this modification by the teachings of Tsimelzon in col. 8 line 55 – col. 9 line 5 and col. 10 line 37 – col. 11 line 20. Therefore, the Examiner maintains the combination of Tso and Tsimelzon is proper.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Buyukkokten, et al. "Efficient Web Browsing on Handheld Devices Using Page and Form Summarization", ACM Transactions on Information Systems, Volume 20, Issue 1, January 2002, pages 82-115 discloses page summarization for limited display handheld devices.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2176

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS

12/22/2005

William L Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
12/28/2005